DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 319 RC 012 169

AUTHOR Heffernan, William D.; Green, Gary
TITLE Part-Time Farming and the Rural Community.
SPONS AGENCY Missouri Univ., Columbia. Extension Div.; Missouri Univ., Columbia. Office of Rural Development.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (Ithaca, NY, August 19-23, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agricultural Trends; *Community Change; Community Study; Comparative Analysis; *Farmers; Life Style; *Part Time Farmers; Quality of Life; Rural Environment; *Rural Farm Residents; Social Change; *Social Integration; Urban to Rural Migration
IDENTIFIERS *Impact Studies; Missouri

ABSTRACT

In order to assess the impact of the growing number of part-time farm families on the nature of social relations in rural communities, part-time and full-time farmers from five counties in South-Central Missouri were compared on three aspects: (1) community integration; (2) perceived benefits from rural living; and (3) goals and priorities they had for the local community. Data were obtained only from townships that did not have a town or village of more than 500 people. Part-time and full-time farmer respondents were divided into three categories according to migration status (which was used as a control variable throughout the analysis): those who had lived in the area seven years or less; those who had lived in the area eight or more years; and lifelong residents. Few differences were found between the groups in regard to the three comparisons. There was some difference between the part-time and full-time farmers in regard to their wishes on attracting more people, tourists, and industry, and also whether additional tax monies should be spent to improve schools. It appeared, however, that a movement toward more part-time farming would have little social consequence for a rural community which had already been integrated into the larger urban social organization. (AN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190319

PART-TIME FARMING AND THE RURAL COMMUNITY[1]

AUG 1980 ERIC/CRESS RECEIVED

William D. Heffernan and Gary Green

Department of Rural Sociology, University of Missouri-Columbia

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary Green

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

The large and growing number of part-time farm families may have an impact on the nature of social relations in rural communities. The purpose of this study was to examine some of the social consequences of part-time farming. Specifically, this paper compares part-time and full-time farmers on the basis of community integration, benefits received from rural living, and goals and priorities they have for the local community. These aspects of community life should give some indication of the possible sources of conflict and strain for change in the rural community. In general, we conclude that a movement toward more part-time farms will have little social consequence for rural communities which have already been integrated into the larger urban social organization.

[1]The authors wish to express their appreciation to the helpful comments they have received from colleagues, in particular Daryl Hobbs, Michael Nolan and Paul Lasley. We are also indebted to the University of Missouri, Office of Rural Development and the Extension Service Personnel in the region for providing the resources which allowed the study to be done.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Ithaca, New York, 19-23 August 1980.

RC 012169

Part-Time Farming and the Rural Community

One of the issue papers prepared by the staff of the USDA for the "Dialogue on the Structure of Agriculture" indicates that 92 per cent of the farmers in this country have some form of non-farm family income. The authors of the article on off-farm employment note, "the shift toward more off-farm work by farm families is one of the most dramatic changes taking place in U.S. agriculture" (Carlin and Ghelfi, 1979:270). Farmers with non-farm sources of income were once seen primarily as those who were trying to accumulate capital and skills for entrance into farming on a full-time basis or as those who were maintaining some form of agricultural production as a mechanism for easing their exit from agriculture. Because previous researchers perceived part-time farming as a transitory stage, part-time farming was approached as a deviant case, peripheral to the core of agricultural production (Douglas and Mackie, 1957; Waldo, 1962; and Krasovek, 1966). Only recently has part-time farming been recognized as a "pervasive and persistent" element of the rural sector (Fuller and Mage, 1976). Today researchers recognize that part-time farming represents a relatively permanent style of life chosen by many and forced upon others. In 1977, Fuguitt, et al. noted, "there is evidence that increasing numbers of farm operators and farm families are continuing in part-time farming throughout their entire association with agriculture" (1977:1).

Several reasons for the increase in part-time farming have been suggested (Cavazzani, 1977). Perhaps the two most

important are: 1) the need for non-farm generated capital to finance an agricultural enterprise, and 2) the nature of large industrial work settings. Retained farm earnings no longer provide sufficient capital for financing most farm operations. The increased cost of farm land, the increased size of farms, and the increased cost of the input variables have combined to greatly increase the need for capital in production agriculture. Writing a decade ago, Hopkin (1970:43) noted that "the average capital investment per farm has increased 850 per cent in the United States since 1940." Led by increased land prices and the cost of petro-chemical inputs, the decade of the seventies saw an even more rapid increase in the capital investment required. As a consequence, many family farms can no longer generate an adequate source of capital through retained farm earnings, and mechanisms which channel non-farm income into agriculture, such as corporate-farm hand structures, and corporate-integrate. structures (Rhodes, 1969), have developed. For private individuals, non-farm employment provides yet another means to attract non-farm capital into agricultural production.

Another reason for the increase of part-time farming is the lack of intrinsic rewards associated with many non-farm occupations (Alleger, 1952). Part-time farmers may have the best of both worlds because they receive economic benefits from the non-farm job and non-material benefits from farming. Individuals alienated in heir non-farm work experience, which provides good income (Kornhauser, 1959; Blauner, 1964), may choose part-time farming because of noneconomic benefits.

Previous research focusing on the relationship between the changing structure of agriculture and the rural community has focused on corporate alternatives to the family farm structure, such as the corporate-farm hand structure and the corporate-integratee structure (Goldschmidt, 1946, 1978; Ploch, 1965; Heffernan, 1972; Rodefeld, 1974; Small Farm Viability Project, 1977, and Heffernan and Lasley, 1978). Although sharing many similarities to what is referred to as the traditional family farm, in which the majority of the labor, capital and management comes from the farm family, part-time farming does represent a modified structure because the traditional family farm provided most of the income and identity for the farm family (Hassinger, 1978: 188).

Most of the recent research on part-time farming has focused on the number of part-time farms and on the characteristics and contributions of part-time farmers to agricultural production, with special attention to types of enterprises (Cavazzani, 1977; Hepp, 1976; Coughenour and Gabbard, 1977; and Carlin and Ghelfi, 1979). Given the impact of the large and growing number of part-time farm families, however, more needs to be known about their impact on local communities. This concern, echoed by many researchers interested in part-time farming, is best expressed in a report of a workshop on part-time farming held in England in 1977 which notes,

> "The origins and future goals of the family farm, particularly the motivation for farming, need to be examined in light of the goals and resources of the region at large. If part-time farming is seen as having an integral part in the total developoment of a rural area, then planners and policy makers need to be made aware of the implications of the growth of this phenomenon, while academicians need to examine the impact of the part-time farming family in the wider context of the rural area, rather than in the agricultural sphere alone" (Fuguitt, et al, 1977:40).

The purpose of this study is to examine some of the social consequences of part-time farming. Specifically, this paper will compare part-time and full-time farmers on the basis of community integration, perceived benefits of rural living, and goals and priorities they desire for the local community. These dimensions will give some indication of the goals of part-time farmers relative to full-time farmers and of the sources of possible conflict and strains for change in the rural community.

Theoretical Orientation

Several authors have suggested that the growth of part-time farming contributes to an increased heterogeneity of rural areas (Melvin, 1954; Wilbur, 1960). They contend that rural society has been characterized by a homogeneity of values, norms, and behavior patterns, and that part-time farming, as an urban influence, will contribute to increased heterogeneity and instability within rural society (Sanders, 1977; Nelson, 1948; Loomis and Beagle, 1950). Bertrand (1967) has suggested that there is strong evidence that social organization patterns are changed as a result of part-time farming. He notes, however, that more study is needed to examine the consequences of these

changes. Donohue (1957), however, found no evidence of differences between part-time and full-time farmers with respect to their attitudes toward four basic institutions -- law, religion, education, and the economy. Moore and Wayt (1956) also produced ambiguous results when assessing attributional differences between full-time and part-time farmers.

Those who have argued that part-time farming would create a major social change in rural communities have assumed that rural communities constitute a Gemeinschaft type of society which has not been exposed to the values and social organization of the larger urban society. However, many of our rural communities have already been absorbed into the urban social organization (Taylor and Jones, 1964). Vidich and Bensman (1968) have suggested several ways in which the urban influence has infiltrated the rural communities. Involvement in the larger industrial world of work is only one of several means by which rural communities are being absorbed into the larger urban social organization. The ambiguous results of past studies and the lack of support for most theoretical orientations on part-time farming may result from a failure to determine the extent to which the commercial full-time farmers, and indeed the community, are currently integrated into the urbanized social organization which shapes the values and behavior patterns of both full-time and part-time farmers.

Secondly, there is a question as to where the part-time farmer works. As industry moves into rural areas (Tillman, 1971), the non-farm income may come from industry located in the rural community or from other jobs in the local service sector. If they

work locally, even in a branch of a large industrial corporation headquartered in an urban area, most of their social contacts may be limited to employees who are friends and relatives within the rural community (Gouldner, 1964). Workers in these work settings have no more contact with the larger mass society than do commercial farmers, who constantly come in contact with the economic sector of the mass society through the buying and selling of farm supplies and products. With the increased amount of industry moving into rural areas, more opportunities exist for employment in social settings which are quite compatible with the social organization and values of the rural community. Thus, as more industry moves into rural areas, providing increased non-farm employment opportunities, and as commercial farmers and the rural community become more involved in the economic, educational and governmental sectors of the mass society, there is reason to believe that increased part-time farming will not necessarily lead to increased heterogeneity, instability, or urban influence. If, on the other hand, the non-farm work is in a city some distance away, the impact may be quite different (Henkel and Fuguitt, 1962).

Methodology

Data for this study were obtained from five counties in South-Central Missouri. In order to focus on a strictly "rural" population, only townships that did not have a town or village of more than 500 people were selected. Twenty-four townships in the five counties met this criterion. An attempt was made to interview an adult in every household in the selected townships.

Of the 3,391 respondents interviewed, 1,695 owned one or more acres of land, but, for the purposes of this study, only the 645 respondents who sold more than $500 worth of farm products during the year prior to the interview were considered farmers. Recognizing the variety of methods which have been used to operationalize part-time farming (Salter, 1936), the percentage of family income derived from the farm was used to differentiate full-time and part-time farmers in this study. Full-time farm households were defined as those with 51 per cent or more of total family income derived from farm income. Conversely, part-time farm households were defined as those which received 50 per cent or less of the total family income from farm operations. Fifty-eight per cent of all farmers in the area received less than half of their family income from farming.

In order to examine the impact new part-time farmers had on the community, migration status was used as a control variable throughout the analysis. Respondents were divided into three categories according to migration status: 1) those who had lived in the community seven years or less, 2) those who had lived in the community eight or more years, and 3) lifelong residents. Seven years was used as a division point since it was about seven years prior to the studythat the area first began to show a sustained growth rate (Campbell et al, 1977).

Fifty-five per cent of the full-time farmers were lifelong residents. Thirty-six per cent migrated into the area at least eight years prior to the study, and the remaining 9 per

cent of the full-time farmers were recent migrants. Fifty-two per cent of the part-time farmers were lifelong residents. A third (35 per cent) of the part-time farmers moved into the area at least eight years prior to the study, and 13 per cent arrived within the last seven years. Half of the part-time farmers migrating to the area were formerly from an urban area.

The study was conducted in an area approximately 75 to 100 miles from St. Louis Metropolitan Area in a region of the Ozarks experiencing a large nonmetropolitan revival (Morrison and Wheeler, 1976). The region is also characterized by many retirement settlements (Campbell, et al., 1978). (Twenty-five per cent of the respondents in the study indicated they were retired.) The area is traversed by a major interstate highway and has been the location of many new industrial sites and recreational/retirement settlements. Among the farm families, only 17 per cent of the heads of households traveled more than 60 miles to work (a radius which would include the greater St. Louis area). Thus, we conclude that most non-farm income is not earned in an urban setting.

Findings

Data in Table 1 indicate that part-time farmers tended to have higher family incomes and more years of education than full-time farmers. They also tended to be younger, although there were more part-time farmers in the 70-74 age category than full-time farmers. When controlling for migrant status, most of the differences between part-time and full-time farmers with respect to SES were found to exist for the new migrants (farmers

living in the community seven years or less). In this group, 24 per cent of the part-time farmers had family incomes of less than $10,000, compared with 57 per cent of the full-time farmers. The size of the difference is less for migrants who have lived in the community for at least eight years. In this group, 63 per cent of the part-time farmers and 78 per cent of the full-time farmers had incomes of less than $10,000. The difference was smallest for lifelong residents, with 72 per cent of the part-time farmers and 78 per cent of the full-time farmers having incomes of less than $10,000.

(TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE)

Data concerning the educational levels of the heads of households present a similar finding: the largest difference in the educational level between part-time and full-time farmers existed for those living in the community seven years or less. In this group, 43 per cent of the part-time farmers had more than a high school diploma, compared with only 24 per cent of the full-time farmers. Among those who had lived in the community eight or more years, 23 per cent of the part-time farmers had more than high school diplomas, compared with 15 per cent of the full-time farmers. Among lifelong residents, there was little difference in the educational level of full-time and part-time farmers; only seven per cent of the respondents in each of the categories had more than high school diplomas. Clearly, the recent migrants were more highly educated, and the difference between the full-time and part-time farmers was greatest for this category.

The data on age show a similar pattern. Among recent migrants, 35 per cent of the part-time farmers were under 40 years of age, compared with 28 per cent of the full-time farmers. Among the less recent migrants, 18 per cent of the part-time farmers were under 40 years of age compared with eight per cent of the full-time farmers. As for lifelong residents, 12 per cent of the part-time farmers were under 40 years of age, compared with 14 per cent of the full-time farmers. Thus, part-time farmers tended to be younger than the full-time farmers, and the differences were greatest among the new migrants.

These findings indicate the need to control for migration status and SES measures of income and education when examining the relationship between part-time farming and the community. Therefore, for the remainder of this analysis, partial correlation coefficients controlling for SES will be provided.

In an effort to measure level of integration into the social life of the community, a set of nine items were used to ascertain the respondents' attitudes toward the community and the extent of their informal interaction with members of the community. Respondents were asked questions such as whether they felt they should attend almost all neighborhood funerals, and whether it would make a difference if they had to move away. (The two questions, "Do you mind asking favors of other persons in this community?" and "Do you feel you are not really a member of the community?" were worded in a reverse manner to the other seven items.) The data in Tables 2 and 3 indicate few differences in the level of community integration of part-time and full-time farmers. The greatest difference between the two

categories was found in the responses to the question about funeral attendance. Here, 59 per cent of the part-time farmers (compared with 54 per cent of the full-time farmers) indicated that they attended almost all neighborhood funerals.

(TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE)

As one might expect, the recent migrants were less integrated into the community than are either the less recent migrants or the lifelong residents. Both full-time and part-time new migrants indicated less integration than did their counterparts who had lived in the community for a longer period of time. Among the new migrants, however, the difference in the levels of integration between full-time and part-time farmers was much greater. In this group, the part-time farmers were much more integrated into the community than were the full-time farmers. For example, 80 per cent of the part-time farmers, compared with only 55 per cent of the full-time farmers, indicated they knew the people living in the community quite well. Among both the less recent migrants and the lifelong residents, few differences were noted between full-time and part-time farmers. The zero-order correlations on Table 3 indicate that for the recent migrant category, only two of the items ("mind asking favors" and "feel you are not really a member of the community") had an r of less than .2, while, for the other two respondent categories, none of the zero-order correlations were equal to or greater than .2. The partial correlation coefficients controlling for SES tended only to strengthen the relationship between the measures for level of community integration and percentage of income derived from farming.

(TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE)

Another aspect of integration into the local community is reflected by distances traveled to obtain goods and services. To the extent that farmers go out of the local community to purchase goods and services, it is doubtful that they will become an integral part of the community. Therefore, respondents were asked how far they traveled to obtain a variety of services and activities (Table 4). Respondents traveled farthest to obtain general medical care and specialized medical care. Farmers traveled the least for religious services, schools, and school activities.

(TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE)

There were few differences between full-time and part-time farmers with respect to distance traveled for a variety of services and activities. There were more differences between full-time and part-time farmers who were recent migrants than there were between full-time and part-time farmers in the other two migrant categories. But, the differences were not consistent. Part-time farmers traveled least for general medical care, religious services, schools, and school activities. For the other services and activities asked about, full-time farmers who had lived in the area less than eight years traveled less. The largest difference was found in the distances traveled to get specialized medical care. Full-time farmers traveled about 47 miles one way, while part-time farmers traveled more than 70 miles one way, to get specialized medical care. Among the items examined, this one appeared to be the major exception. The

partial correlation coefficients controlling for SES (Table 5) found that SES did not have much of an effect on the original relationships.

(TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE)

The respondents were asked about their reasons for living in rural communities. They were asked to indicate, for each of 14 items which are frequently given as reasons for living in rural communities, how important they considered each item to be. The importance of the reason was measured using a seven point scale. Data in Tables 6 and 7 suggest that there were few differences between full-time and part-time farmers on these items. The greatest difference was for the item "good schools"; 66 per cent of the full-time farmers indicated "good schools" as an important reason, while only 57 per cent of the part-time farmers indicated this as important.

(TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE)

Again, on these measures, the greatest difference between full-time and part-time farmers occurred among the recent migrants. In this group, part-time farmers were more likely than full-time farmers to indicate "friendly community" as a reason for living in the rural community (83 per cent and 53 per cent respectively). Ninety-five per cent of the part-time farmers indicated that they liked being out of doors, compared with only 70 per cent of the full-time farmers. Also, part-time farmers were more likely to list "outdoor recreation" as an important reason for living in rural communities. For the recent migrants, the partial correlation coefficient tended to increase in magnitude over the zero-order correlation (see Table 7). The

part-time farmers stressed reasons such as "friendly community," "safe to be out alone at night," "more privacy," and "liking to be out of doors and involved in outdoor recreation" as reasons for living in the rural community. The full-time farmers stressed items such as "avoid the noise and hassle of the city," "employment opportunities," "having relatives living in the community," and "greater opportunity for self-sufficiency."

(TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE)

In order to ascertain potential arenas of conflict, respondents were asked what the future developmental priorities of the communities should be (Table 8). They were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with five items related to programs the county might adopt. Twenty per cent of the full-time farmers, compared with only eight per cent of the part-time farmers, agreed that the county should discourage people and industry from moving in. Fifty-eight per cent of the part-time farmers, compared with only 47 per cent of the full-time farmers, felt that the community should try to attract tourists. Few differences existed between the part-time and full-time farmers with respect to whether or not the county should "provide more businesses and employment," "bring in new employment opportunities," and "attract new residents." The majority of both types of farmers agreed that the county should adopt these policies. Among recent migrants, there was little difference between full-time and part-time farmers on the question of whether the county should discourage people and industry from locating in rural communities. The greatest difference between full-time and part-time farmers was observed among the less

recent migrants. It was in the category of lifelong residents, however, that the greatest disagreement occurred between full-time and part-time farmers over the question of whether the county should try to attract tourists. Sixty per cent of the part-time farmers compared with only 39 per cent of the full-time farmers, felt that the county should try to attract tourists. The measures with the fewest differences between recent migrants and lifelong residents were those that concerned goals of the community and the priority of these goals. With the exception that full-time farmers were more inclined to want to discourage people and industry from locating in the area, the differences between full-time and part-time farmers in all categories were not great.

(TABLES 8 AND 9 ABOUT HERE)

The respondents were also asked how they felt additional tax dollars should be spent. They were given nine government services which are, or could be, supported by tax dollars, and asked whether they agreed or disagreed that more money should be directed toward these services. The major difference between full-time and part-time farmers with respect to the nine items had to do with improving schools. Fifty-two per cent of the part-time farmers compared with only 37 per cent of the full-time farmers, felt that more tax dollars should be directed to this end. That 27 per cent of the part-time farmers were less than 45 years of age (versus 18 per cent of the full-time farmers) may help to explain some of the difference in emphasis placed on schools. In general, the differences between full-time and part-time farmers concerning ways additional tax money should be

spent were not substantial. With the exception of road improvement, part-time farmers were more likely than full-time farmers to feel that more tax dollars should be directed toward each of the nine suggested government services. In controlling for SES (Table 9), a greater difference was observed between full-time and part-time farmers on items concerning expenditure of tax dollars for schools, medical facilities, law enforcement, and provision of water districts. However, even though the greatest difference between full-time and part-time farmers was found among recent migrants, the full-time farmers were consistently more likely to indicate that additional tax dollars should be directed toward a variety of government services. This finding is just the reverse of the findings based upon all farmers in the community. Part-time farmers were more likely than full-time farmers to feel that additional tax dollars should be directed toward schools, medical facilities, and improving trash collection. Full-time farmers, on the other hand, were more likely to indicate that additional tax dollars should be directed toward the other six government services. It is among lifelong residents that one finds the greatest difference between full-time and part-time farmers on these measures. Among lifelong residents, part-time farmers were more likely than full-time farmers to feel that additional tax dollars should be directed toward each of the nine government services. With the exception of "improving schools" and "better medical facilities," much of the difference between these full-time and part-time farmers was diminished by controlling for SES. In fact, five of the nine partial correlations had signs in the direction opposite

to the zero-order correlations, suggesting that when one controls for SES, the full-time farmers were more likely to feel that additional tax dollars should be directed toward five of the services than were the part-time farmers. Although a difference was found between full-time and part-time farmers with respect to what they felt the county should try to do, and what they felt tax dollars should be directed toward, the difference was not as great as one might expect. Further, the SES and migration variables certainly confound the results. The SES and migration status variables are as important in predicting priorities of the community as are the types of farms.

Summary and Conclusions

The data suggest that the part-time farmers were younger than the full-time farmers, and that they also had higher income and more education. However, the migrants, especially those who had arrived in the seven years prior to the study, accounted for most of the difference. Little difference existed between full-time and part-time farmers who were lifelong residents. Because new migrant farmers (both full-time and part-time) tended to be younger and because full-time farmers had lower incomes than part-time farmers, it is posible that many of the young new migrants who were full-time farmers were part of the "back to the land" movement and that they were involved in a more subsistence-type agriculture. The finding that full-time farmers who were new migrants had less education, however, would raise some doubt about such a conclusion. The disproportionate number (28 per cent) of full-time farmers who were recent migrants and

who were also between 60 and 64 years of age might help to explain the lower income.

Little difference was observed between full-time and part-time farmers regarding their reported level of participation in the social activities of the community or in their perception of their integration into the community. Again, it is mostly within the category of new migrants that the greatest differences occurred. Within this category, part-time farmers were the more integrated. These findings clearly challenge the previous literature, which argued that part-time farming would lead to major social changes for the rural community since it introduces elements from the larger, mass society. It may be the non-farm work experience which brings the new migrants into greatest contact with members of the community and which thereby facilitates integration into the community. Data from those respondents who had migrated into the area more than seven years prior to the study suggest that, over time, both full-time and part-time farmers became more integrated into the community and that the difference between them was gradually reduced.

Part-time and full-time farmers traveled approximately the same distance for a variety of services and activities. These findings tend to complement the measures regarding level of community integration. Part-time farmers appeared to have been involved in social relations in the community as much as full-time farmers.

Little difference existed between full-time and part-time farmers in regard to reasons for living in rural areas. Full-time farmers tended to stress items such as "good place to

raise children," "lack of choice," and "employment opportunities" more than part-time farmers. Part-time farmers, on the other hand, tend to give greater emphasis to "friendly community," "privacy," and "outdoor activities." Undoubtedly reasons for living in rural areas are related to the level of social involvement in the community. The emphasis that both full-time and part-time farmers, but especially the latter, place on "friendly community," for example, is undoubtedly related to extent of community involvement.

Because little difference existed between full-time and part-time farmers in regard to reasons for living in rural areas, one is not surprised that little difference was found between them in their perception of goals and priorities for the county. The major difference between full-time and part-time farmers had to do with attitudes they hold regarding the desirability of attracting more people, industry, and tourists into the county. Full-time farmers, especially the natives, were more likely to want to discourage people and industry from moving into the area, and they were less eager for the county to promote tourism. The only other major difference found between full-time and part-time farmers had to do with whether additional tax monies should be spent to improve schools. Although the differences were not great, part-time farmers, more than full-time farmers, expressed the feeling that more tax dollars should be directed toward each

of the nine government services. The only exception was "road improvement." Much of the difference, however, was related to the ability to afford higher taxes, since the difference between full-time and part-time farmers was largely eliminated when controlling for SES. While these differences in attitudes regarding use of tax monies may produce strains within the community, it is unlikely that improved schools and medical facilities would lead directly to major changes in the social organization of the community.

One must be careful in generalizing from any study of part-time farming. The concept of part-time farming, or even of full-time farming, has been operationalized and measured in a variety of ways in the past. Further, the terms "part-time farmer" and "full-time farmer" represent a wide variety of persons with different interests and motivations for farming. The findings of this study of a region of increasing population may or may not be applicable to areas experiencing continuous out-migration or to urban fringe areas in which many of the part-time farmers commute to the city for work. We have attempted to describe the area we studied in some detail to suggest the types of communities which might experience social consequences similar to the ones we have analyzed here.

In general, we conclude that a movement toward more part-time farming will have little social consequence for a rural community in an area which has already been integrated into the larger urban social organization. With the exception that part-time farmers are more inclined to want to attract tourists and less inclined to discourage industry, there is little reason

to think that part-time farming will change the community's social structure. Because part-time farmers emphasize, as reasons for living in rural areas, items such as "friendly community," "safe community," "lack of noise and hassle of the city," and other values which are frequently associated with a gemeinschaft society, it appears they are no more likely than full-time farmers to want to see major changes in their communities.

TABLE 1

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PER CENT OF FAMILY INCOME DERIVED FROM FARMING AND INCOME, EDUCATION, AND AGE

	All Farmers			Controlling for Migration Status								
				Less Than 7 Years			More Than 7 Years			Lifelong Resident		
	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma
Income												
Less than 3,000	9[a]	14	-.22[c]	0	9	-.34	11	14	-.29	11	17	-.12
3,000-5,999	25	31		11	24		20	32		33	30	
6,000-9,999	28	31		13	24		32	32		28	31	
10,000-14,999	22	14		46	14		23	10		14	17	
15,000 or more	16	10		30	29		14	12		14	5	
	100	100		100	100		100	100		100	100	
	(280)[b]	(265)		(37)	(21)		(100)	(96)		(137)	(139)	
Education												
Less than 12 years	51	61	-.19	22	40	-.36	47	58	-.22	63	66	-.04
12 years	32	28		35	36		30	27		30	27	
More than 12 years	17	11		43	24		23	15		7	7	
	100	100		100	100		100	100		100	100	
	(306)	(300)		(40)	(25)		(107)	(110)		(152)	(154)	
Age												
Less than 30	3	4	.05	5	0	.28	3	4	.05	3	5	-.06
30-39	14	8		30	28		15	4		9	9	
40-44	10	6		23	0		8	6		9	8	
45-49	8	11		13	12		7	11		8	10	
50-54	10	12		2	20		10	8		11	13	
55-59	12	16		10	4		8	22		15	14	

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

	All Farmers			Controlling for Migration Status								
				Less Than 7 Years			More Than 7 Years			Lifelong Resident		
	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma
Age (Cont.)												
60-64	15	17		7	28		19	17		13	14	
65-69	10	12		5	8		14	14		9	11	
70-74	11	7		5	0		9	7		14	8	
75 or more	7	7		0	0		7	7		9	8	
	100	100		100	100		100	100		100	100	
	(302)	(296)		(40)	(25)		(105)	(107)		(150)	(153)	

[a]Per Cent

[b]Number of cases

[c]Tests of significance are not reported due to the fact that we are dealing with a population rather than a sampler.

TABLE 2

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCENT OF FAMILY INCOME DERIVED FROM FARMING AND COMMUNITY INTEGRATION

Aspects of Community Life	All Farmers			Controlling for Migration Status: ≤7 Years			>7 Years			Lifelong Resident		
	Per Cent Yes											
	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma
Shop on open store night?[a]	7[b](20)[c]	5 (15)	.14	8 (3)	0 (0)	1.0	7 (7)	7 (8)	-.05	7 (10)	5 (7)	.19
Attend almost all neighborhood funerals?	59(179)	54(159)	.10	38 (15)	14 (3)	.58	54 (58)	46 (50)	.17	68(102)	65(100)	.06
Hard to find better place to live in country?	86(260)	83(247)	.09	85 (34)	61 (14)	.57	80 (85)	80 (88)	.01	90(136)	89(137)	.06
Make a difference if you had to move away?	88(268)	85(251)	.16	78 (31)	52 (12)	.52	91 (96)	80 (87)	.46	90(136)	92(142)	-.13
Feel free to visit most people?	93(284)	92(273)	.11	90 (36)	70 (16)	.59	91 (96)	91 (99)	-.02	97(146)	96(147)	.16
Know people living here well?	92(280)	93(272)	-.07	80 (32)	55 (12)	.54	92 (98)	92(100)	-.01	95(145)	98(149)	-.41
Mind asking favors?	22 (66)	19 (57)	.07	28 (11)	44 (10)	-.34	27 (29)	22 (23)	.15	16 (24)	14 (22)	.06
Feel you are not really a member of the community?	8 (24)	11 (31)	-.16	18 (7)	30 (7)	-.35	10 (11)	11 (12)	-.03	3 (5)	8 (12)	-.43
Feel you should attend most social functions?	48(140)	50 (44)	-.04	36 (14)	5 (1)	.82	52 (53)	47 (19)	.10	48 (68)	60 (90)	-.23

[a]Respondents could answer among four responses: yes, definitely; yes, probably; no, probably; no, definitely. Two categories were constructed - yes and no.

[b]Per Cent.

[c]Number of cases.

TABLE 3

PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR COMMUNITY INTEGRATION

Aspects of Community Life	Controlling for Migration Status							
	All Farmers		≤7 Years		>7 Years		Lifelong Residents	
	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 578	Partial[b] Correlation Coefficient n = 100	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 59	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 12	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 208	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 31	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 293	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 49
Shop on open store night?[a]	.07	.01	.38	.50	-.05	-.06	.06	-.08
Attend almost all neighborhood funerals?	.01	.08	.27	.25	.00	-.06	.01	.18
Hard to find better place to live in country?	-.03	-.05	.20	.45	.01	-.03	-.08	-.07
Make a difference if you had to move away?	.04	-.05	.29	.34	.15	.15	-.04	-.13
Feel free to visit most people?	.02	-.08	.25	.37	.05	-.24	.01	.10
Know people living here well?	-.06	-.13	.23	.41	.00	-.28	-.09	.00
Mind asking favors?	-.02	.03	-.19	-.13	.04	-.11	-.01	-.03
Feel you are not really a member of the community?	-.06	.07	-.08	.09	-.14	.04	-.05	-.05
Feel you should attend most social functions?	-.04	-.04	.41	.63	-.02	-.28	-.10	-.05

[a]Respondents could answer among four responses: yes, definitely; yes, probably; no, probably; no definitely.

[b]Recognizing the problems of using parametric statistical techniques with ordinal level data, the use of the partial correlation appeared to be the most effective method of controlling for the SES measure of family income and education. Thus zero-order correlations and partial correlations are presented.

TABLE 4

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PER CENT OF INCOME EARNED FROM FARMING AND DISTANCE TRAVELED TO SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES

Services and Activities	Controlling for Migration Status: All Farmers Part Time	All Farmers Full Time	All Farmers ETA^2	Less Than 7 Years Part Time	Less Than 7 Years Full Time	Less Than 7 Years ETA^2	More Than 7 Years Part Time	More Than 7 Years Full Time	More Than 7 Years ETA^2	Lifelong Resident Part Time	Lifelong Resident Full Time	Lifelong Resident ETA^2
Grocery Shopping	12[a] (304)[b]	12 (298)	.00	13 (40)	13 (24)	.00	12 (106)	12 (110)	.00	12 (151)	12 (153)	.00
Shop for Major Appliances	18 (293)	17 (282)	.00	23 (38)	20 (23)	.00	18 (102)	15 (103)	.01	17 (146)	17 (146)	.00
Get General Medical Care	22 (304)	22 (291)	.00	19 (40)	26 (23)	.03	24 (105)	22 (106)	.00	21 (152)	20 (151)	.00
Get Specialized Medical Care	62 (262)	54 (249)	.02	70 (31)	47 (20)	.11	63 (93)	58 (89)	.01	59 (133)	52 (130)	.02
Banking	12 (303)	12 (293)	.00	12 (40)	11 (23)	.01	12 (107)	12 (108)	.00	11 (149)	11 (151)	.00
Repairs or Service for Car or Major Appliance	14 (293)	15 (278)	.00	16 (39)	12 (23)	.03	14 (102)	14 (105)	.00	12 (145)	15 (142)	.02
Attend Religious Services	7 (281)	7 (267)	.00	8 (33)	13 (19)	.08	7 (97)	8 (98)	.00	6 (144)	5 (140)	.01

TABLE 4 (Cont.)

Services and	Controlling for Migration Status											
	All Farmers			Less Than 7 Years			More Than 7 Years			Lifelong Resident		
	Part Time	Full Time	ETA^2	Part Time	Full Time	ETA^2	Part Time	Full Time	ETA^2	Part Time	Full Time	ETA^2
School and School Activities	9 (159)	10 (137)	.00	10 (27)	10 (13)	.00	9 (60)	10 (47)	.02	9 (68)	9 (71)	.00
Recreation	12 (212)	11 (180)	.00	15 (28)	14 (18)	.00	12 (75)	10 (65)	.00	10 (105)	11 (92)	.00

[a]Mean miles driven one way.

[b]Number of cases.

TABLE 5

PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR DISTANCE TRAVELED TO SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES

	Controlling for Migration Status							
	All Farmers		≤ 7 Years		> 7 Years		Lifelong Residents	
Services and Activities	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 523	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 100	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 58	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 16	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 191	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 31	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 278	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 49
Grocery Shopping	.03	.07	-.01	-.17	.04	.02	.03	.16
Shop for Major Appliances	-.05	.01	-.05	-.11	-.11	-.11	.01	.10
Get General Medical Care	.00	.11	.18	.22	-.05	.07	-.02	.10
Get Specialized Medical Care	-.13	-.08	-.33	-.26	-.07	.13	-.13	-.19
Banking	-.01	-.06	-.09	-.05	.00	-.05	-.02	-.05
Repairs or Service for Car of Major Appliance	.04	.08	-.18	-.32	-.01	-.10	.14	.25
Attend Religious Services	.00	-.03	.27	.31	.05	.02	-.12	-.20
School and School Activities	.04	.12	.06	-.00	.14	.14	-.02	.11
Recreation	-.01	.03	-.01	.07	-.06	-.15	.04	.21

TABLE 6

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCENT OF FAMILY INCOME DERIVED FROM FARMING AND REASONS FOR LIVING IN RURAL COMMUNITIES

Reasons for Living in Rural Communities	All Farmers			Controlling for Migration Status: ≤7 Years			>7 Years			Lifelong Residents		
	Per Cent											
	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma
Friendly community[a]	76[b](204)[c]	71 (182)	.12	83 (29)	53 (10)	.63	75 (72)	64 (60)	.26	76 (99)	77 (102)	-.03
Safe to be out alone at night	73 (198)	73 (189)	.00	73 (27)	62 (12)	.22	73 (71)	66 (63)	.18	75 (97)	78 (104)	-.09
Avoid noise and hassle of city	82 (224)	82 (209)	.02	87 (32)	80 (16)	.23	80 (78)	77 (72)	.09	83 (109)	84 (111)	-.01
Healthier place to live	92 (253)	93 (241)	-.05	87 (32)	84 (16)	.09	96 (93)	89 (86)	.50	93 (123)	97 (129)	-.45
More privacy	92 (253)	90 (232)	.17	95 (35)	85 (17)	.51	94 (91)	84 (81)	.50	92 (122)	94 (124)	-.17
Good place to raise children	84 (228)	87 (231)	-.13	76 (28)	75 (15)	.02	88 (85)	86 (85)	.08	84 (110)	91 (124)	-.29
Like being out of doors	91 (250)	89 (231)	.12	95 (35)	70 (14)	.76	90 (87)	90 (86)	.01	92 (122)	91 (121)	.05
Employment opportunities	26 (70)	30 (75)	-.09	25 (9)	26 (5)	-.03	34 (33)	27 (26)	.17	21 (27)	29 (37)	-.21
Have relatives living here	50 (134)	53 (134)	-.06	36 (12)	21 (4)	.36	44 (43)	43 (40)	.04	58 (77)	63 (83)	-.10
More opportunities for self sufficiency	78 (210)	80 (209)	-.09	78 (29)	74 (14)	.13	76 (74)	77 (74)	-.02	79 (102)	83 (112)	-.14
Outdoor recreation	75 (205)	70 (177)	.14	75 (27)	53 (10)	.46	72 (70)	68 (64)	.10	80 (105)	73 (96)	.17
Never had a choice	11 (27)	14 (33)	-.13	10 (3)	0 (0)	1.0	8 (7)	14 (12)	-.29	13 (16)	16 (21)	-.14
Couldn't find a place to live in town	5 (12)	3 (8)	.17	3 (1)	0 (0)	1.0	3 (3)	5 (4)	-.18	6 (8)	3 (4)	.35
Good Schools	57 (154)	66 (164)	-.19	51 (19)	44 (8)	.14	52 (49)	58 (53)	-.12	64 (83)	75 (97)	-.26

[a]Respondents were given seven possible choices to rank the given reason for living in rural communities: + and rank 1; + and rank 2; + and unranked; 0; - and unranked; - and rank 2; - and rank 1. Two categories of responses were constructed - positive and nonpositive. Gamma was calculated for these two categories and positive responses were reported.

[b]Per Cent. [c]Number of cases.

TABLE 7
PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR REASONS FOR LIVING IN RURAL COMMUNITIES

Reasons for Living in Rural Communities	Controlling for Migration Status							
	All Farmers		≤ 7 Years		> 7 Years		Lifelong Residents	
	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 523	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 100	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 54	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 12	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 181	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 31	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 252	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 49
Friendly community[a]	.07	.08	.30	.44	.11	-.40	.02	.34
Safe to be out alone at night	.03	.05	.03	.32	.15	.00	-.03	.08
Avoid noise and hassle of city	.02	-.02	-.11	-.26	.04	-.01	.04	-.02
Healthier place to live	-.01	-.15	.01	-.04	.13	.22	-.11	-.42
More privacy	.09	-.04	.03	.25	.19	.26	.03	.28
Good place to raise children	-.06	-.01	.10	.17	.00	-.14	-.12	.16
Like being out of doors	-.04	.00	.40	.45	-.06	.07	-.09	-.21
Employment opportunities	-.03	.03	-.08	-.25	.10	-.07	-.07	.18
Have relatives living here	.01	-.04	.24	-.43	.01	-.06	.02	.05
More opportunities for self sufficiency	-.07	-.05	.06	-.22	-.07	-.02	-.10	-.04
Outdoor recreation	.09	.06	.30	.34	.06	-.04	.10	.14
Never had a choice	-.11	-.08	.00	-.11	-.12	-.23	-.13	.03
Couldn't find a place to live in town	.05	.12	.07	.06	-.01	-.10	.06	.26
Good Schools	-.06	.00	.12	.28	-.07	.00	-.06	.07

[a]Respondents were given seven possible choices to rank the given reason for living in rural communities: + and rank 1; + and rank 2; + and unranked; 0; - and unranked; - and rank 2; - and rank 1.

TABLE 8

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCENT OF FAMILY INCOME DERIVED FROM FARMING AND COMMUNITY GOALS AND PRIORITIES

Counties should try to . . .	All Farmers			Controlling for Migrant Status: ≤7 Years			>7 Years			Lifelong Resident		
	Per Cent Yes											
	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma	Part Time	Full Time	Gamma
Discourage people[a] and industry from moving in.	8[b] (22)[c]	20 (53)	-.49	17 (6)	18 (4)	-.04	9 (9)	28 (28)	-.58	5 (7)	15 (20)	-.53
Try to attract tourists.	58 (153)	47 (124)	.21	56 (20)	62 (13)	-.13	53 (47)	54 (53)	.00	60 (82)	39 (53)	.41
Provide more businesses and employment.	81 (228)	81 (266)	.00	70 (26)	83 (19)	-.34	74 (71)	78 (78)	-.11	90 (128)	83 (120)	.28
Bring in new employment opportunities.	95 (283)	92 (258)	.31	90 (34)	87 (20)	.12	95 (98)	89 (93)	.43	97 (145)	94 (135)	.36
Attract new residents.	65 (162)	62 (158)	.06	61 (22)	65 (13)	-.08	59 (52)	68 (65)	-.20	69 (83)	55 (71)	.28
More tax dollars should be directed toward . . .												
Improving schools.[d]	52 (143)	37 (103)	.29	54 (20)	50 (10)	.08	52 (47)	40 (40)	.23	52 (74)	33 (49)	.37
Building parks.	39 (111)	32 (89)	.16	26 (10)	44 (10)	-.38	40 (39)	33 (33)	.15	42 (60)	29 (43)	.28
Better medical facilities.	82 (239)	75 (217)	.20	75 (27)	61 (14)	.32	84 (86)	80 (82)	.13	82 (121)	74 (112)	.25
Improving law enforcement.	83 (242)	80 (229)	.11	69 (27)	79 (19)	-.26	87 (87)	85 (87)	.10	83 (121)	76 (114)	.22
Better services for senior citizens.	70 (199)	66 (181)	.11	53 (19)	67 (12)	-.28	71 (70)	76 (77)	-.12	74 (105)	58 (84)	.35
Improving roads.	82 (246)	83 (240)	-.02	70 (28)	77 (17)	-.19	83 (86)	87 (94)	-.17	85 (127)	79 (119)	.18
Providing water districts.	21 (45)	20 (49)	.01	16 (5)	26 (5)	-.30	25 (21)	24 (21)	.02	19 (19)	18 (22)	.06
Rural fire protection.	68 (182)	66 (181)	.04	63 (24)	63 (15)	.01	68 (63)	70 (69)	-.06	70 (91)	64 (90)	.12
Improved trash collection.	36 (91)	29 (77)	.16	39 (14)	35 (7)	.08	37 (34)	33 (32)	.10	34 (40)	25 (35)	.20

[a] Respondents answered yes or no to these community goal items.

[b] Number of cases.

[c] Per Cent.

[d] Respondents were given four possible responses: strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. Gamma was calculated for two categories - those who agreed or disagreed.

TABLE 9
PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR COMMUNITY GOALS AND PRIORITIES

			Controlling for Migration Status					
	All Farmers		≤ 7 Years		> 7 Years		Lifelong Residents	
Counties should try to . . .	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 506	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 100	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 57	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 12	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 183	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 31	Zero Order Correlation Coefficient n = 224	Partial Correlation Coefficient n = 49
Discourage people and industry from moving in.[a]	-.17	-.24	-.01	-.64	-.24	-.18	-.16	-.21
Try to attract tourists.	.11	.33	-.06	.26	.00	-.02	.22	.34
Provide more businesses and employment.	.00	-.07	-.14	.35	-.05	-.26	.10	.01
Bring in new employment opportunities.	.08	.17	.04	.59	.12	.34	.07	-.15
Attract new residents.	.03	.15	-.04	.47	-.10	-.17	.14	.25
More tax dollars should be directed toward . . .								
Improving schools.[c]	.17	.28	-.07	.45	.13	.21	.23	.32
Building parks.	.14	.01	-.13	.18	.15	.06	.18	-.08
Better medical facilities.	.15	.25	.20	.54	.11	.02	.19	.41
Improving law enforcement.	.10	.17	.07	.46	.09	.20	.12	.05
Better services for senior citizens.	.07	.00	-.14	-.23	-.04	-.02	.19	.07
Improving roads	.02	-.03	-.03	-.01	-.04	.22	.10	-.18
Providing water districts.	.04	-.21	.10	.19	.05	-.07	.00	-.36
Rural fire protection.	.04	.09	.03	.49	.02	.16	.07	-.04
Improved trash collection.	.10	.00	.09	.04	.03	.07	.14	-.09

[a]Respondents answered yes or no to these community goal items. [b]Number of cases.

[c]Respondents were given four possible responses: strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.

REFERENCES

Alleger, Daniel E.

1952 Basic Motivations in Part-time Farminng. Unpublished Paper, Florida Agricultural Experiment Station.

Bertrand, Alvin Lee

1967 "Research on Part-time Farming in the United States." Sociologia Ruralis, Vol. VII, No. 3:295-306.

Blauner, Robert

1964 Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry. Chicago:

Campbell, Rex R. Dailey, and R. McNamara

1978 Population Change in the Ozarks Region: 1970-1975. (A Report to the Ozarks Regional Commission), Columbia, Missouri: Department of Rural Sociology, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Carlin, Thomas A. and Linda M. Ghelfi

1979 "Off-farm Employment and the Farm Sector," in Structure Issues of American Agriculture. U.S. Department of Agriculture: Agricultural Economic Report 438.

Cavazzani, Ada

1977 Part-time Farming: A Functional Form of Agricultural Organization in the United States. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, Department of Rural Sociology. Draft Manuscript.

Coughenour, Milton C. and Anne V. Gabbard

1977 Part-time Farmers in Kentucky in the Early 1970's: The Development of Dual Careers. RS-54: Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station.

Donohue, G.A.

1957 "Full-time and Part-time Farmers Value Orientations Towards Social Institutions." Rural Sociology, 22: 221-7.

Douglas, G.V. and A.B. Mackie

1957 Some Social and Economic Implications of Part-time Farming. Rep. TVA Division. Agric. Relat., Agric. Econ. Brch., Knoxville, Tennessee: No. T.57-1AE.

Fuguitt, G.V., A.M. Fuller, H.A. Fuller, R. Gasson, and G. Jones

1977 Part-time Farming: Its Nature and Implications: A Workshop Report. Ashford, Kent: Centre for European Agricultural Studies, Wye College (University of London).

Fuller, A.M. and J.A. Mage (eds.)

1976 "Newcomers to Agriculture," in Part Time Farming, Problem or Resource in Rural Development. University of Guelph.

Goldschmidt, Walter

1946 "Small Business and the Community: A Study in the Central Valley of California on the Effects of Scale of Farm Operation." Report of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business. U.S. Senate, 79th Congress, 2nd Session, Committee Print 13, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1978 As You Sow: Three Studies in the Social Consequences of Agribusiness. Montclair, New Jersey: Allanheld, Osmun and Company.

Gouldner, Alvin

1964 Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Hassinger, Edward W.

1978 The Rural Component of American Society. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Heffernan, William D.

1972 "Sociological Dimensions of Agriculture Structures in the United States." Sociologica Ruralis, 12:481-99.

Heffernan, William D. and Paul Lasley

1978 "Agricultural Structure and Interaction in the Local Community: A Case Study." Rural Sociology, 43, 3: 348-361.

Henkel, Ramon E. and Glenn Fuguitt

1962 "Non-farm Occupational Role Involvement and the Visiting Relationships of Farmers." Rural Sociology, 27:53-63.

Hepp, R. and R. Thompson

1976 Description and Analysis of Michigan Small Farms. Research Report 296: Michigan State University, Agricultural Experiment Station.

Hopkin, John

1970 "Financing Farm Growth," in Corporate Farming and the Family Farm. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Kornhauser, W.

1959 The Politics of Mass Society. New York: The Free Press.

Krasovec, S.

1966 The Future of Part-time Farming. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference of Agricultural. Economists, London: Oxford Press.

Loomis, Charles and J. Allan Beegle

1950 Rural Social Systems. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Melvin, Bruce L.

1954 "The Place of the Part-time Farmer." Rural Sociology, 19, 3:281-286.

Moore, H.R. and W.A. Wayt

1956 The Part-time Route to Full-time Farming. Bulletin, Kentucky Agriculture Experiment Station, Lexington, Kentucky: No. 646,

Morrison, P. and J. Wheeler

1976 "Rural Renaissance in America." Population Bulletin, 31:5-22.

Nelson, L.

1948 Rural Sociology. New York: American Book Co.

Ploch, Louis A.

1965 A Comparison of the Social Characteristics of Maine's Contact and Independent Table - Egg Producers. Maine Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Maine, Publication 670, p. 28.

Rhodes, V. James

1969 "What's Ahead for U.S. Agriculture?" Paper presented at the 40th Annual Meeting of the National Council for Farmer Cooperatives, Washington, D.C..

Rodefeld, Richard

1974 The Changing Organizational and Occupational Structure of Farming and the Implications for Farm Work Individuals, Families and Communities. Madison: University of Wisconsin, unpublished Ph.D. thesis.

Salter, L.A.

1936 "What is Part-time Farming?" Journal of Farm Economics, 18, 1:191-7.

Sanders, Irwin

1977 Rural Sociology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Small Farms Viability Project

1977 The Family Farm in California. The State of California and the Community Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

Taylor, Lee and Arthur R. Jones

1964 Rural Life and Urbanized Society. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tillman, David A.

1971 "Plant Location in Rural Areas: Some coinsiderations." Industrial Development, 140 (March): 17-18

Vidich, Arthur Joseph Bensman

1968 Small Town in Mass Society. (Revised edition.) Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Waldo, A.D.

1962 Off-farm Employment of Farm Operators in the U.S. Unpublished thesis, Michigan State University.

Wilber, George L.

1962 "Changing Interpersonal Relations in Land Tenure System," in Alvin L. Bertrand and Floyd L. Corty (eds.), Rural Land Tenure in the United States. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press.